

In support of this indication, the IPEA/US refers to its comments on claims 4 and 11 and states as follows:

"As per claim 4, Vin et al. teach a teleconferencing system essentially as claimed, comprising:

- a) a plurality of stations [fig. A "workstation"]
- b) a first network for carrying data [fig. A "data"]
- c) at least a second display for displaying visual images [fig. 7A "monitor"]
- d) AV path for video [p.70 fig. A "analog video and audio"]; . . .

As per claim 11, Vin et al. teaches a conference manager for data and an AV conference manager

["Phoenix," "Macaw," fig. 7A "video manager," see pp. 72-74]."

Applicant respectfully disagrees and as discussed below, does not believe the claimed invention is obvious as suggested.

In particular and as the Examiner is aware "[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." MPEP, 6th Edition, §2143.03.

The Vin apparatus does not disclose the elements of the invention as claimed. At a minimum, Vin does not disclose an AV conference manager which utilizes the data network operating system and protocol as claimed in claim 2. Indeed, it cannot.

The Vin apparatus is a patchwork of three prior systems -- the Etherphone, Macaw and Phoenix systems. It borrows data (first) and digital voice control (second) networks from the Etherphone

system and patches onto this the analog video (third) network from the Macaw system. There is no disclosure of using the data network operating system and protocol during an AV conference.


Furthermore, at an absolute minimum, the Vin arrangement requires two conventional digital network connections (from the Etherphone system) plus a "coax" video network connection (from the Macaw system) at each workstation. Thus a minimum of three networks and associated connections are required.

This patchwork arrangement uses the Macaw system for analog video while digital audio is provided by the Phoenix 64kBps digital audio extension on page 78, third column, second complete paragraph ("Since our system transmits digital audio and analog video,...) and cannot support the claimed configuration.

For these reasons, therefore, the independent claims are submitted to be non-obvious and patentable.

Accordingly, it is believed that the dependent claims are patentable as well (MPEP 6th Ed. § 2143.03). If the Examiner is of the opinion that the allowance of the claims can be expedited by a conference, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



CRAIG P. OPPERMAN
Reg. No. 37,078

Dated: June 7, 1996

Cooley Godward Castro Huddleson & Tatum
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Telephone: (415) 843-5000
Facsimile: (415) 857-0663